

REMARKS

The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, and 12-17 are pending in the present application. Claim, claim 11 having been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 16-17 having been added herein. No new matter is added.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement that certified copies of all priority documents have been received by the U.S.P.T.O. Action, summary at 12.

Applicants respectfully note the present action indicates that the drawings have been accepted by the Examiner. Action, summary at 10.

Applicants respectfully note the present action indicates that the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) submitted on July 14, 2006 has been received and considered by the Examiner.

Applicants also respectfully note the present action indicates that the Applicants' oath/declaration has been reviewed by the Examiner and is found to conform the requirements prescribed in 37 CFR § 1.63.

Example Embodiments

A non-limiting example embodiment is described to assist the Examiner in understanding the present Application. Applicants submit that this description is only to assist the Examiner's understanding and should not limit any of the claims. Instead, each claim should be interpreted solely by the features presented therein and the accompanying disclosure in the specification.

According to a non-limiting example embodiment of the present Application, and also illustrated in Figure 1 of the present Application, a method for transparent access authentication of subscribers connected to an authenticating network domain may include receiving a context creation request from a subscriber through a Gateway GRPS Support Node 1; assigning an IP address to the context; receiving an check-in ID from the subscriber through a Radius server 2; receiving a private identification (PrivID) from the subscriber; and authenticating the subscriber by comparing the check-in ID with the pre-recorded ID for match at a proxy server 5. The PrivID may be correlated with a pre-recorded ID of the subscriber in a subscriber database 4; the check-in ID may be a Mobile Station ISDN Number (MSISDN) or an International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) received from the subscriber; the pre-recorded ID may be the subscriber's MSISDN or IMSI pre-recorded in a subscriber database 4.

Specification

Arrangement of Specification

The Examiner suggests modifying the layout for the Specification of the present Application.

In response to the suggestion, Applicants thank the Examiner for the suggestion and amend the layout for the Specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Objections due to Formalities

On page 3, line 30, a close bracket is missing and the language “terrestrial” should be capitalized.

In response to the objection, Applicants amended the objected paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims Objections

Claim 5 stands objected to because of the following informalities: the limitation “Radius server (5)” refers to the drawing by reference number 5. However, the reference number for Radius server in Figure 1 of the present Application is referenced by reference number 2.

Applicants note these objections and amend claim 5 accordingly. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 4-8 and 12-15 stand objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75(c) as being in proper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim.

Applicants note these objections and amend the claims accordingly. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claims Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The Examiner alleges that “a first authentication unit (2)” and “a second unit (5;6)” in claim 9 are not included in the disclosure.

Applicants respectfully disagree. As seen in claims 10 and 12, one possible embodiment of the claimed first authentication unit is a registration server, and one possible embodiment of the claimed second unit is a proxy server. Both the registration server and the proxy server are described and shown in the specification and figures. Thus, the first authentication unit and the second unit are described in the specification, and that disclosure is such that would enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention. Nothing more is required.

With respect to the claim limitation “a first authentication unit (2) is connected via a data line to a second unit (5 and/or 6)”, Applicants have amended claim 5 to clarify the connections between the elements. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to disclose a connection between routing module (7) in claim 15 and registration server (2) in claim 10.

Applicants have amended claim 15 to address the connection issue. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-5, 9-12, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,977,917 (“Skog”).

Skog discloses a method for a wireless application protocol (WAP) to associate an MSISDN of a mobile terminal with a temporarily assigned IP address. As illustrated in Figure 2 of Skog, a WAP system includes a WAP gateway 70, a WAP server 75 and a mapping session database 80 within the WAP gateway 70, and a remote authentication dial-in user service (Radius) server 60 that can communicate with the WAP gateway 70. The mapping session

database 80 stores the assigned temporary IP address and the associated MSISDN of a mobile terminal 45 (column 3, lines 61-65). During a communication stage between the mobile 45 and the WAP gateway 70, a Radius accounting message, which includes the MSISDN number and the IP address of the mobile terminal 45, is transmitted from the Radius server 60 to the WAP server 75 (column 3, lines 61-column 4, lines 11). Upon receiving the Radius accounting message, the mapping session database 80 is updated (column 3, lines 61-65). Correspondingly, the MSISDN and the IP address are correlated in the mapping session database 80.

In Figure 5, Skog discloses a signal diagram of a service network 150, which is an IP network that provides internet access for users of a mobile terminal 155. The service network 150 also includes the WAP functionality described in Figure 2 (column 5, lines 32-36). When the mobile terminal 155 requires a particular application provided by the service network 150, the Radius server 165 performs an authentication process for the mobile terminal 155 with a user database 170, which “contains information on the user of the mobile terminal 155.” (column 5, lines 46-55). “After authentication, the access server 160 generates an accounting start request message ...[which] includes the MSISDN and IP address for the mobile terminal [155].” (column 5, lines 55-61). Then the IP address and MSISDN information for the mobile terminal 155 is transmitted to and stored in a session database 175 which, according to the analysis set forth for WAP and Figure 2, is then updated by the information. Later, when the mobile terminal 155 accesses the mail server 180 for particular services, the mail server 180 makes a request of the session database 175 for the provided user’s IP address to be translated into the MSISDN, and then “the mail server 180 requests the user parameters from the user database 170 by using the provided MSISDN.” (column 6, line 14-23).

In rejecting the original claim 4, the Examiner relies on this Figure 5, and column 6, line 14-23 of Skog, and alleges that the mail server 180 makes a request of the session database for the provided user's IP to be translated to MSISDN, then the mail server 180 requests the MSISDN from user database 170. The Examiner alleges that "i[f] there is a match [between the two MSISDNs, then] the access is granted." (Office Action, page 7). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants note that the features in original claim 4 have now been incorporated in independent claim 1. Accordingly, the following remarks will address the rejection of claim 4, as well as claim 1.

According to the above analysis, column 6, line 14-23 of Skog discusses communication between the mobile terminal 155 and the mail server 180 after the authentication has been completed. Skog does not disclose matching the MSISDN from the mobile terminal 155 with the MSISDN from the user database 170 during the authentication procedure.

In addition, Skog discloses that two databases 170 and 175 contain information of the mobile terminal 155. Skog does disclose that the user database 170 contains information from the mobile terminal 155. However, Skog does not disclose the specific information contained in the user database 170. Therefore, Skog does not disclose or even suggest that the user database contains the IP address and MSISDN of the mobile terminal 155. Although the session database 175 includes the IP address and MSISDN information of the mobile terminal 155, Skog explicitly discloses that the information is updated during the authentication procedure, not pre-recorded information before the authentication procedure.

Further, in Skog, the mail server 180 obtains the MSISDN by translating the user's IP address from the session database 175, and the mail server 180 uses the MSISDN to "request[] the user parameters from the user database 170." It would thus be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the mail server 180 uses the MSISDN as a label in searching information of the user parameters, not to compare the MSISDN from the session database to authenticate the user.

Accordingly, Applicants submits that Skog fails to disclose "authenticating the subscriber by comparing the check-in ID with the pr-recorded ID for match," as recited in the amended independent claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable, and claims 3-5, 9-12, and 14 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1 and features recited therein. Thus, withdrawn of the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 9-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully request.

Claims Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skog in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,155,526 ("Chaudhary"). Claims 6, 7, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skog in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0154400 ("Pirttimaa"). Claims 8 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skog in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,517 ("Naim"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable. Further, each of Chaudhary, Pirttimaa, and Naim fails to overcome the noted deficiency of Skog. Therefore, Skog, Chaudhary, Pirttimaa, and Naim, either considered independently or combined, fail to disclose or teach all features of independent claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2, 6-8, 13, and 15 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 and features recited therein. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 6-8, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

New Claims

By the present Amendment, Applicant submits that claims 16 -18 have been added. New claims 16 and 17 are allowable for their dependency on the base claim, claim 1, as well as for the additional features recited therein. Claim 18 is an independent claim including the features of original claims 1, and 3-6. Claim 18 is believed to be patentable at least for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Support for claims 16 and 17 can be found at least in the Specification and the figure as originally filed. Specifically, support for claims 16 can be found at least in page 4, lines 1-17 of the Specification and Figure 1. Support for claims 17 can be found at least in Figure 1 and page 4, lines 4-6 of the Specification. Support for new claim 18 can be found in at least original filed claims 1 and 3-6. As such, Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Conclusion

Appln. No. 10/566,584
Amdt. dated February 17, 2009
Reply to Office action of October 15, 2008

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-18 are patentable over the prior art of record whether taken alone or in combination as proposed in the Office Action.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-628-5197.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /Ronni S. Jillions/
Ronni S. Jillions
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:HL
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\R\rieb\blicker1\Pto\2009-02-17amendmentWithTrackedChanges.doc